

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Prior to the Office Action, claims 1-30 were pending. Within the Office Action, claims 1-30 are rejected. The Applicant is currently adding claims 40-45. Accordingly claims 1-30 and 40-45 are currently pending in this application.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection - Gopinath in view of Japan**

Within the Office Action, claims 1, 8-16, 19, 20, 23, 25 and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,951,765 to Gopinath et al. (hereinafter "Gopinath") in view of Japanese Patent No. 7-24679 (hereinafter "Japan '679"). For the reasons outlined below, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections made within the Office Action and submit that the claims, as presented above, are in condition for allowance over Gopinath in view of Japan '679.

One basic criteria to establish a prima facie case of obviousness is that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the present invention. As amended, claims 1 and 16 contain a limitation providing a "means for injecting a second chemistry into the system for supercritical processing, wherein the second chemistry is injected through an injection port separate from the means for injecting a processing chemistry into the system for supercritical processing" and claim 30 contains the limitation that the apparatus contain "a second inlet line for introducing a second chemistry into the circulation loop." Neither Gopinath, nor Japan '679 teach such a limitation. Therefore the references do not establish a prima facie case of obviousness and claims 1, 16 and 30 are allowable over Gopinath and Japan '679. Claims 2-15, 17-29 and 40-45 all contain such a limitation by implication, and therefore are also allowable over Gopinath and Japan '679.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection - Gopinath in view of DeYoung**

Also, within the Office Action, claims 2-5, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopinath in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,782,900 to DeYoung et al. (hereinafter "DeYoung"). For the reasons outlined below, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections made within the Office Action and submit that the claims as presented above are in condition for allowance over Gopinath in view of DeYoung.

Again, a basic criteria to establish a prima facie case of obviousness is that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the present invention. As explained above, Gopinath does not teach or suggest the all the limitations required by the present invention. Furthermore, De Young does not teach such limitations either. DeYoung describes a method and apparatus for cleaning and treating a substrate using CO<sub>2</sub>. However, DeYoung does not describe a process which cleans or rinses the object with a chemistry such as a cleaning chemistry (e.g., solvents, co-solvents and/or surfactants) or a rinsing chemistry (e.g., water and a solvent such as ethanol, acetone or isopropyl alcohol). Furthermore, De Young does not teach a system wherein the cleaning chemistry or rinsing chemistry is injected into the system "through an injection port separate from the means for injecting a processing chemistry into the system for supercritical processing", nor "a second inlet line for introducing a second chemistry into the circulation loop". Claims 1, 16 and 30 of the present invention all require such limitation. Therefore the references do not establish a prima facie case of obviousness and claims 1, 16 and 30 are allowable over Gopinath in view of DeYoung. Claims 2-15, 17-29 and 40-45 all contain such a limitation by implication, and therefore are also allowable over Gopinath and De Young.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection - Gopinath in view of Fan**

Also, within the Office Action, claims 6, 7, 21, 22, 24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gopinath in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,620,524 to Fan et al. (hereinafter "Fan"). For the reasons outlined below, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections made within the Office Action and submit that the claims as presented above are in

condition for allowance over Gopinath in view of Fan.

Again, a basic criteria to establish a prima facie case of obviousness is that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the present invention. As explained above, Gopinath does not teach or suggest the all the limitations required by the present invention. Furthermore, De Young does not teach such limitations. Fan describes a dual plunger system for continuous and pulse-free delivery of reagents for semiconductor processing. Fan does not describe a process which cleans or rinses the object with chemistry such as a cleaning chemistry (e.g., solvents, co-solvents and/or surfactants) or a rinsing chemistry (e.g., water and a solvent such as ethanol, acetone or isopropyl alcohol). Furthermore, Fan does not teach a system wherein the cleaning chemistry or rinsing chemistry is injected into the system “through an injection port separate from the means for injecting a processing chemistry into the system for supercritical processing”, nor “a second inlet line for introducing a second chemistry into the circulation loop”. Claims 1, 16 and 30 the present invention all require such limitation. Therefore the references do not establish a prima facie case of obviousness and claims 1, 16 and 30 are allowable over Gopinath in view of Fan. Claims 2-15, 17-29 and 40-45 all contain such a limitation by implication, and therefore are also allowable over Gopinath and De Young.

CONCLUSION

As shown by the preceding arguments, neither Gopinath, Japan '679, DeYoung nor Fan disclose the limitations in claims 1, 16, and 30 of Applicant's invention, as currently amended. As such, the invention would not have been obvious to one normally skilled in the art at the time of the invention. Claims 2-15 and 17-29 also contain the limitations by reference. Therefore, the Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (408) 530-9700.

Respectfully submitted,

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: 7-17-07

By: Thomas B. Haverstock  
Thomas B. Haverstock  
Reg. No.: 32,571  
Attorneys for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))  
I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Date: 7-17-07 By: Mary Jo